

REMARKS

In this Supplemental Amendment, Applicants have additionally canceled claim 90 and claim 119 that was initially presented with the Amendment filed June 1, 2009. The newly appearing claim 119 in the present set of claims corresponds to claim 120 initially submitted in the Amendment of June 1, 2009. The additional amendment to claim 8, next to last line, replaces “comprising” to “comprises” to correct the grammar. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter has been inserted into the application.

Since the claims presented in this Supplemental Amendment are identical to the claims submitted with the Amendment filed June 1, 2009, except for the cancellation of claim 90 and the renumbering of claim 120 as claim 119, it is believed that all of the arguments set forth in the June 1, 2009 Amendment are applicable to support the allowability of the present set of claims.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants’ representative thanks Examiner Pande for courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on July 9, 2009. During the interview, the following agreement was reached.

(1) The obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome by the submission of the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 filed June 1, 2009.

(2) The obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 8 and 20, as well as 91 and 93 is maintained.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 8, 20, 91 and 93 were provisionally rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7 and 8 of application no. 10/836,376 (now U.S. Patent No. 7,488,595). Applicants traverse this rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested. However, in order to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, Applicants submit herewith a statement disclaiming the terminal part of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term of prior patent no. 7,488,595. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection has been overcome.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that no further fee is due to consider the present amendment. Nevertheless, the Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. **502486**.

Dated: July 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph Hyosuk Kim/
Joseph Hyosuk Kim, Ph.D
Registration No.: 41,425

JHK Law
P.O. Box 1078
La Canada, CA 91012-1078
Tel: 818-249-8177
Fax: 818-249-8277